

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James Rose,

Plaintiff,

v.

Thierry Nettles, Andrew Rockefeller, William
Cline, Wellington Williams, Casper Phiri,
Sylvester Sanchez, Albert Mack, Timmothy
Clark, and Von Mutius,

Defendants.

C/A No. 0:17-2000-RBH-PJG

ORDER

Plaintiff James Rose, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging a violation of his constitutional rights. This matter is before the court on the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 49.)

There is no right to appointed counsel in § 1983 cases. Hardwick v. Ault, 517 F.2d 295 (5th Cir. 1975). The court may use its discretion to request counsel to represent an indigent in a civil action. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); Mallard v. United States Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296 (1989). However, such discretion "should be allowed only in exceptional cases." Cook v. Bounds, 518 F.2d 779, 780 (4th Cir. 1975). Whether exceptional circumstances are present depends on the type and complexity of the case, and the *pro se* litigant's ability to prosecute it. Whisenant v. Yuam, 739 F.2d 160 (4th Cir. 1984), abrogated on other grounds by Mallard, 490 U.S. 296.

Upon review of the file, the court has determined that there are no exceptional or unusual circumstances presented at this time, nor would the plaintiff be denied due process if the court denied

plaintiff's request for counsel. Id. Further, the plaintiff has presented no evidence supporting a finding that any health issues would interfere with his ability to prosecute his claims. Based on the pleadings before the court, the plaintiff writes well and appears capable of addressing the legal issues. Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion requesting counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Paige J. Gossett
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

March 15, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina